



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

tion as Eubuleus he regards as impossible. The Mantinean reliefs "may be attributed, at least in design, to Praxiteles himself, though the execution was probably left to assistants".

The fine bronze athlete from Anticythera he regards as a Hellenistic work, and not as a product of the fourth century, and he, therefore, rejects the suggestion of Loeschke and others that it represents the Perseus of Euphranor.

These examples are sufficient to show his views on some of the problems in the history of Greek sculpture where opinions differ.

Perhaps it may sound like a paradox to say that Professor Gardner's book is so good that one cannot help wishing that it were better; but he had a great opportunity to produce a work that was really up to date in all respects and that he has not done. I do not mean by this that there are many mistakes in his book. The actual mistakes are very few; but there are omissions where one would look for information. For example, on pages 479 ff. he discusses the work of Boethus and merely mentions, without describing, the signed herm from Mahdia. An illustration of this herm should at least have been included; and other sculptures from this find in the sea should have been discussed. In his account of the Niobe group (459 ff.) he says nothing of any fifth century Niobids (see Furtwängler in *Sitzb. Mun. Akad.*, 1907, 207 ff.; also articles by Sauer and della Seta). Again, nothing is said of the Aphrodite of Cyrene; or of the Ludovisi throne and its remarkable counterpart in Boston, for, even if Professor Gardner is not convinced that his former strictures on the last named work are undeserved, he should at any rate have mentioned its existence. Other treasures of Greek art in this country, such as the beautiful head from Chios, now in Boston, are passed over in silence. A few things need revision, such as the statement that the Victory of Samothrace "carries a cross-tree, the framework of a trophy". Svoronos has shown sufficiently that she carries a standard, which took the place of a modern flag.

Misprints appear to be very rare. The illustrations themselves are not of uniform excellence. Some are very good, while others, such as those on pages 115, 141, 416, 497, and 501, are decidedly poor. Many could be added to advantage, especially in the sections dealing with the early development of sculpture. In the matter of spelling Greek proper names it is a relief to find "Mycenae", "Polycritus", and the like, instead of the German-Greek forms affected by many writers.

It is needless to comment further. The book is one which all students of ancient art will be glad to see. It will undoubtedly be much used.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

WILLIAM N. BATES.

A History of Sculpture. By Harold North Fowler. New York: The Macmillan Company (1916). Pp. xxvi + 445. \$2.00.

In writing this brief History of Sculpture, Professor Fowler has justly earned the thanks of those who have

long deplored the lack of a book that should be at once scholarly and appreciative, discriminating and comprehensive. There is no lack of literature on special sculptors and periods, but until now no attempt has been made to treat the entire subject of ancient and modern sculpture within the limits of a handbook. The difficulties inherent in the task are readily apparent: that they have been met with signal success will be evident to all who examine the book with care.

The author has aimed to give a history of sculpture "intended for the use of the general public and of young students, not a work of research for the enlightenment of scholars". In a work of this scope we may reasonably expect a sense of proportion, exact scholarship, and good style. Professor Fowler has so fully met these requirements that his book is sure of a long term of usefulness. In general no exception can be taken to the space devoted to the various periods. Greek sculpture, for example, takes up 76 of the 418 pages devoted to the history proper, the Renaissance in Italy, 44, and Egyptian sculpture, 23 pages. One might wish, however, that the 9 pages devoted to the relatively unimportant Etruscan sculpture had been given instead to the sculpture of the Far East (12 pages), which, as the author fully recognizes, is inadequately treated. While it is perfectly true that Chinese and Japanese sculpture "has not affected the development of our own art", still its scant consideration in a general history of sculpture is to be regretted, not only because the sculpture of the Far East is significant and beautiful in itself, but also because information regarding it is comparatively inaccessible to the general reader. The Irish and Scandinavian influence upon medieval sculpture in England, in the opinion of the reviewer, merits more than the passing allusion on page 227. And Troubetzkoy, one feels, has been rather summarily dispatched in the three compact sentences which close the all too brief account of the Russians. It is a question, too, whether such lists of names as occur on pages 212, 356, 361, 362, 375, and 376, serve a useful purpose. The author's aim, an entirely laudable one, to compress much information into the space at his disposal, leads in some instances, particularly in some of the later chapters, to a manner of enumeration which is not always happy. In fairness to Professor Fowler it should be said, however, that, in a field where the material is overwhelming and eclecticism imperative, his taste is just and sure.

The book has the supreme merit of scholarly accuracy—a rather rare thing in a field where the desire to provide 'atmosphere' often results in a flagrant neglect of the 'dry light' proverbially, but incorrectly, ascribed to Herakleitos. Minor misprints may be found, especially in the spelling of some names and in the Index, but it is not necessary to catalogue them here. The statement (38) that "few artists of any age have succeeded better than those who carved these <Assyrian> reliefs in reproducing the characteristic motions of different animals", is, perhaps, excessive praise. 'Aegean' is certainly preferable to "Cretan" or "Minoan"

(54) as a term to denote a certain civilization. In connection with the note (86.1) on Myron's group of Athene and Marsyas, attention might have been called to the excellent article by Jonas Meier, *Die Marsyasgruppe des Myrons*, in *Neue Jahrbücher*, 35-36 (1915), 8-15. The statement (112) that the Hermes of Praxiteles is "the only attested original work of any of the most famous Greek sculptors" overlooks the Victory of Paionios. Bryaxis (120) is credited with the Gany-mede in the Vatican: this is, of course, a slip for Leochares. Pasiteles (136) scarcely comes under the Hellenistic Period, and to include the Sidamara Sarcophagus (3d century A.D.) is to give wide limits to the term Hellenistic. The date of Tino di Camaino's Tomb of Henry VII at Pisa (190) is 1315, not 1313. To say (310) that Girardon's Tomb of Richelieu is in the Sorbonne may prove misleading: it is in the Church of the Sorbonne. It is questionable if such sculptors as Girardon, Falconet, and Houdon can properly be classed under the "Renaissance in France". And lastly it is not certain that Veit Stoss was born at Nuremberg.

The 195 illustrations are uniformly excellent and greatly enhance the appearance and usefulness of the volume. Where so much is given, it may seem captious to clamor for more. We miss, however, the Egyptian 'Nefert'; the Demeter of Knidos; the horsemen of the Parthenon frieze; Agasias's 'Fighter' in the Louvre; the Hermes in the Naples Museum; the Virgin of Giovanni Pisano, in the Campo Santo at Pisa; Niccolò Uzzano (whether it be Donatello's or not); Jacopo della Quercia's Tomb of Ilaria del Carreto at Lucca, if it be his; Houdon's Voltaire; Gallori's Garibaldi in Rome; St. Gaudens's Sherman in New York, and the splendid Buddha in the British Museum. Ancient sculptures are illustrated chiefly by reproductions of the Brunn-Bruckmann plates. In many instances, however, photographs by Brogi, Alinari, Anderson, or Mansell represent the pose better, and ought therefore to supersede the German work. This applies especially to the Euthydikos statue; the Doryphoros; the Aphrodite of Knidos; Praxiteles's Faun; the Apoxyomenos; the statue of Agias; and the Venus of Melos.

The style is uniformly good: it is clear and direct, but not flexible. But, where the prime purpose is to present the maximum amount of information within the limits set by a brief handbook, one cannot reasonably expect the charm and the brilliance that might characterize an essay or essays on the development of sculpture. In brief, Professor Fowler has written an exceedingly serviceable book.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

J. G. WINTER.

The Georgics and Eclogues of Virgil. Translated into English Verse by Theodore Chickering Williams. With an Introduction by George Herbert Palmer. Cambridge: Harvard University Press (1915). Pp. 166. \$1.00.

The need of a translation for continuous reading aloud to his pupils, Dr. Williams tells us in the Preface to the

library edition of his translation of the Aeneid, forced him to make versions of his own that should appeal especially to the ear, and from these, little by little, the rendering of the twelve books was completed. Existent rhymed versions, he found, all had a comic flavor, those in prose were in English of a mongrel stamp, and even the most scholarly and elegant were unsuited for his purpose. His first aim, after accuracy, was lucidity—an endeavor to make the narrative move swiftly and clearly. He frankly recognized, therefore, the impossibility "of bringing over the full magic and suggestion of every Virgilian phrase", and sought the middle way between artificiality and commonness, subordinating details to the whole epic effect. He tried to give life to the speeches as wholes and to make them true to character. He would connote the religious character of Vergil's language by analogous use of Biblical or liturgic phrase. True to his author he would be, scorning such inventions and licenses

as were a translator's merry privilege in the eighteenth century, before the Germans were civilized and before the grim spirit of science had invaded literature.

Mr. Williams's translation of the Aeneid appeared in 1908 (Houghton Mifflin Co.). That it fulfills this modest programme to the satisfaction of the modern public is shown by the fact that the publishers have felt warranted in bringing out a cheaper edition (1910) for wider use in Schools. This reception encouraged the author also to proceed to the translation of the Bucolics and the Georgics, which now appears as a posthumous work. Whether a similar success here was even to be hoped for is doubtful. In his translation of the Aeneid the splendid vigor of the narrative carried the reader along, despite Dr. Williams's modest disclaimer of any attempt to transfer full poetic value. In this later work one feels everywhere a lack of distinction and the charm that illumines every phrase of Vergil's Latin. The spirit is gone. If that is a good translation which suggests to one who knows the original something of its quality, Dr. Williams's version will fall far short of our ideal. Let such a reader compare with this rendering the Latin of any of his favorite passages and disappointment will inevitably follow: Vergil's rich color and resonance are unrecognizable in what will too often appear but the plainest paraphrase. But, after all, to say this is not to condemn Dr. Williams's work: it is merely to bring out anew the truth that poetry is essentially untranslatable. We have here a worthy, if uninspired, rendering which can be freely recommended to all such as would become acquainted with Vergil's great work in English, to whom verse is pleasanter reading than prose. Verse is often almost as faithful to the letter as prose: *eripias si tempora certa modosque*, there would be small ground for choice. In fact, verse at times allows a translator greater opportunity to be literal. Yet, Dr. Williams's versions, as he says of his rendering of the Aeneid, are in no sense a 'pony'. What has been said applies to both Georgics and Eclogues and may serve to show why the reviewer